

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 12-33 were pending in the application, of which Claims 12 and 23 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated April 24, 2003, Claims 21 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Claims 12, 13, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and Claims 12-14, 18-25, and 29-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 15-17 and 26-28 were objected to, but were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In the Advisory Action dated October 21, 2003, the Examiner stated that the rejection of Claims 21 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112 was overcome by the Amendment After Final filed on September 24, 2003. Following this response, Claims 12-33 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated April 24, 2003, the Examiner rejected Claims 12, 13, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,022,034 ("*Matsuda*"). Furthermore, in the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 12-14, 18-25, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,781,039 ("*Ribarev*") in view of *Matsuda*. Claims 12 and 23 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome these rejections and add no new matter.

Amended Claims 12 and 23 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that they each recite, for example, a Raschel-type flat warp knitting machine. In the Advisory Action dated October 21, 2003, the Examiner stated, in response to Applicant's arguments made in the Amendment After Final filed September 24, 2003, that a flat warp knitting machine is not recited in the rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent Claims 12 and 23 to recite a Raschel-type flat warp knitting machine and respectfully submit that *Ribarev and Matsuda*, in contrast with amended Claims 12 and 23, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest a Raschel-type flat warp knitting machine. Accordingly, independent Claims 12 and 23 patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of Claims 12 and 23.

Dependent Claims 13-22 and 24-33 are also allowable at least for the reasons above regarding independent Claims 12 and 23, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 12 and 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of dependent Claims 13-22 and 24-33.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 26, 2004

By: 

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640
(404) 653-6559

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com